# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

This environmental impact statement examines the potential impacts to the natural and human environment resulting from the disposal and reuse of the U.S. Army Jefferson Proving Ground (JPG) in Madison, Indiana.

In response to changing global security requirements and mandates of federal law, the Department of the Army is reducing its force structure, resulting in the need for fewer installations to station the smaller force. In 1989, the Secretary of Defense approved the recommendation of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission to close and dispose of the JPG. Cessation of operations is to occur not later than September 30, 1995.

## BACKGROUND

The JPG consists of 55,264 acres in southeastern Indiana, approximately eight miles north of the Indiana-Kentucky border. The JPG's assets include 379 buildings, 196 miles of improved roads, and 48 miles of boundary fenceline. The installation occupies parts of Jefferson, Jennings, and Ripley Counties. Its mission has been to perform production and post-production tests of conventional ammunition components and other ordnance items and to conduct tests of propellant ammunition/weapons systems and components for the U.S. Army. The JPG mission has been realigned to the Yuma Proving Ground in Arizona.

## PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action analyzed in this environmental impact statement is the disposal of the JPG facility. Reuse of the excessed property is analyzed as a secondary and cumulative impact of disposal. Reuse is a direct action of other federal, state, local, and private entities.

## DISPOSAL PROCESS

Several steps must be taken to prepare the JPG facility for disposal. The property must be screened to determine potential demand by subsequent users. These include elements of the Department of Defense, other federal agencies, approved providers of homeless assistance per the McKinney Act, and state and local entities. Expressions of interest may be consummated by outright transfer to another federal agency, assignment pursuant to the McKinney Act, public benefit discount conveyance, or sale to government entities or the public. Interim measures, such as leasing portions or all of the facility, may also be taken.

The screening process has resulted in an expression of interest by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for transfer of approximately 53,000 acres of the installation to that agency for development of a wildlife refuge. Discussions between Army and Fish & Wildlife Service officials and local community leaders and representatives are expected to result in a reduction of the amount of acreage requested by the Fish & **Wildlife Service.** The general purpose of these discussions is to reach accord on ways to accommodate local communities' interests in attaining economic development of portions of the JPG.

## DISPOSAL ALTERNATIVES AND REUSE SCENARIOS

For analysis purposes, the Army has delineated 12 study areas at the JPG. These are identified as follows:

Study Area 1. A 53,000 acre parcel for development of a wildlife refuge by the Fish & Wildlife Service.

Study Area 2. The 4,320 acres lying in the southernmost portion of the base (Jefferson County).

Study Area 3. A 1,500 acre parcel on the eastern border of the base (Jefferson County).

Study Area 4. A 500 acre parcel on the eastern border of the base (Ripley County).

Study Area 5. A 640 acre parcel at the northeast corner of the base (Ripley County).

Study Area 6. A 130 acre parcel west of Study Area 5 and dependent upon development of Study Area 7 (Ripley County).

Study Area 7. A 240 acre parcel along the northern border of the base for a 500 foot right of way for highway development (State of Indiana).

Study Area 8. A 400 acre parcel in the northwestern corner (Jennings County).

Study Area 9. Two parcels totaling 75 acres near the western border of the base to permit access to existing low water crossings (Jennings County).

Study Area 10. A 1,100 acre parcel on the western border of the base (Jefferson County).

Study Area 11. A 1,033 acre parcel in the north central portion of the base for continued use as an air gunnery range (Ripley County).

Study Area 12. A 140 acre parcel for a 300 foot right of way for an east-west road approximately bisecting the base (State of Indiana).

Evaluation of environmental impacts of the disposal alternatives and reuse scenarios is based on this segmentation of the installation.

In analyzing the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action, the Army has identified three alternatives to disposal.

*No action alternative.* Closure of the JPG and realignment of the installation's mission has been mandated. The Army has begun preparing the property for disposal. Property not sold or transferred after closure and realignment will be placed in caretaker status, the no action alternative.

*Encumbered disposal.* Certain natural and man-made circumstances have potential to cause environmental impacts upon disposal. These are identified as encumbrances. The encumbered disposal alternative has been formulated to consider the effect of the Army's imposing certain encumbrances on future owners as a condition of transfer. To varying degrees, the Army may be able to control these encumbrances and, accordingly, their environmental and socioeconomic impacts. Encumbrances relevant to disposal of the JPG include unexploded ordnance, depleted uranium, measures to protect surface water quality, an air gunnery range buffer, utilities

activities, reversionary clauses in favor of the Fish & Wildlife Service, wetlands, and endangered species.

*Unencumbered disposal.* The unencumbered disposal alternative is included in order to identify and evaluate the potential to remove encumbrances, thereby allowing the property to be disposed of with fewer or no Army imposed restrictions to future use.

Consideration of the encumbrances helps to identify not only environmental and socioeconomic factors but also matters such as cost, temporal requirements, and reuse suitability factors. Upon evaluation of all of the alternatives and their potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts, the Army's preferred alternative is encumbered disposal of the JPG.

Regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality require evaluation of reasonably foreseeable actions, without limitation on the party conducting those future actions, and evaluation of consequent environmental impacts. In addition to development and evaluation of disposal alternatives, the Army has identified three levels of reuse intensity that may occur. Following disposal, property may be subject to high intensity reuse, medium intensity reuse, or low intensity reuse. Scenarios involving each of these intensity levels have been developed for the study areas.

## ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

Resource areas selected for evaluation include land use, socioeconomic and community facilities, public health and safety, utilities and solid waste, visual resources, cultural resources, traffic and transportation, noise, air quality, geology, soils, and topography, biological resources, water resources, and hazardous materials and hazardous waste (including unexploded ordnance and depleted uranium).

Direct and indirect impacts on the resource areas of any of the three disposal alternatives would include a variety of short and long term adverse and beneficial impacts. There would be no significant impacts in connection with any of the three disposal alternatives.

Direct and indirect impacts on the resource areas of the three reuse scenarios would generally include a variety of short and long term adverse and beneficial impacts. High intensity reuse of Study Areas 2 through 6, 8, and 10 would result in long term significant direct adverse impacts on land use. High intensity reuse of Study Areas 2 through 8, 10, and 12 would result in long term significant direct adverse impacts on utilities and solid waste and biological resources. Medium intensity reuse of Study Areas 3 through 6, 8, and 10 would result in long term significant direct adverse impacts on utilities and solid waste. Medium intensity reuse of Study Area 7 would result in long term significant direct adverse impacts on public health and safety. High intensity reuse of Study Areas 3 through 6, 8, and 10 would result in long term significant indirect adverse impacts on land use.

Cumulative impacts are those resulting from the incremental impact of the proposed action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The proposed action of disposal would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts. High intensity reuse, especially if in conjunction with unencumbered disposal, could result in significant impacts to land use.

## MITIGATION

The Army will seek to avoid, reduce, or compensate for adverse impacts.

Adherence to the terms of a memorandum of agreement between the Army, the Indiana SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will help alleviate potential adverse impacts to archaeological sites and historic resources. Installation security, emergency services, and maintenance operations in accordance with Army policies during a caretaker period will minimize

deterioration and help maintain property values both on and off the installation. Prioritization of remedial actions and use of leases will help ensure timely disposal and reuse.

With respect to the encumbered and unencumbered disposal alternatives, the Army will continue to work with the Local Redevelopment Authority to identify buildings not having interdependent utilities systems and to identify means to effect disposal most consistent with reuse plans. The Army will also complete cultural resources surreys and related actions.

The Army acknowledges that mitigation of impacts which result from reuse are beyond its control and authority. In conducting this analysis of impacts, the Army recognizes that certain actions could help to avoid, reduce, or compensate for adverse impacts. Measures that future owners could take include exercise of sound discretion in land use planning and infrastructure development. Adherence to deed restrictions and enforcement of zoning, subdivision regulations, and building permits could help maintain visual resources inherent at the JPG site. Implementation of best management practices to control stormwater runoff and creation of buffer zones around new development could enhance biological resources protection, especially for those resources which are dependent on the environment of the several streams that cross the installation.